



# County of Los Angeles

## CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012  
(213) 974-1101  
<http://cao.co.la.ca.us>

DAVID E. JANSSEN  
Chief Administrative Officer

May 21, 2003

Board of Supervisors  
GLORIA MOLINA  
First District

YVONNE BRATHWAITE BURKE  
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY  
Third District

DON KNABE  
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH  
Fifth District

To: Supervisor Yvonne Braithwaite Burke, Chair  
Supervisor Gloria Molina  
Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky  
Supervisor Don Knabe  
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: David E. Janssen  
Chief Administrative Officer

### STATE LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

#### Pursuit of County Position on Budget Item

**Budget Item 5175-101-0001** in the Proposed FY 2003-04 Budget reduces funding for county Child Support Departments by \$40 million. Los Angeles County's Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) funding is proposed to be reduced by \$10.6 million, which will result in a loss of up to 300 staff and reduce collections by up to \$46 million.

In addition to the \$10.6 million reduction, DCSS is also faced with an inequitable base allocation from the State. Los Angeles County has 25.3 percent of California's child support caseload and 28 percent of the Statewide population, yet receives only 20 percent of the State budget allocation for child support services. If the methodology were changed to base the allocation on each county's caseload, the DCSS would receive 5 percent more funding, or \$35 million, and the Department would be in a better position to absorb the proposed budget reduction. **Therefore, our Sacramento advocates will support full restoration of funding for county Child Support Departments and a revision to the allocation methodology that currently underfunds Los Angeles County by failing to reflect actual caseload.** Support is consistent with County policy to support full-funding of County child support collection program costs. This item is scheduled to be heard in the Assembly Budget Subcommittee No. 1 on Wednesday, May 21, 2003.

### **Pursuit of County Position on Legislation**

**AB 206 (Richman)**, as introduced on January 28, 2003, would enact the Emergency Health Powers Act and would define the powers of both State and local health authorities during a declared public health emergency. It would require the Governor to appoint a Public Health Emergency Planning Commission to develop a State-wide emergency plan. AB 206 combines many of the existing powers of State and local health officers to control and prevent the spread of disease with existing emergency powers of the Governor. In addition, it grants the Governor the power to declare a state of public health emergency and confers broad powers on the Governor during an emergency, such as the authority to suspend the provisions of any regulatory statute prescribing procedures for State business and to use all available resources of the State and local governments.

The California State Association of Counties (CSAC) and the County Health Executives Association of California (CHEAC) jointly oppose AB 206 indicating that current law already provides the necessary framework for an effective response to public health emergencies. Both CSAC and CHEAC express particular concern that the definition of public health authority in the measure circumvents the authority of county boards of supervisors, which have the responsibility to ensure the public health and safety of residents of their county. Under the measure, the director of the State Department of Health Services, rather than the Board of Supervisors, has the authority to designate a person to act on behalf of the county for purposes of the act.

Our Department of Health Services (DHS) indicates that during a declared public health emergency this measure would result in additional requirements and restrictions placed on vital disease surveillance, prevention and control powers, currently broadly available to local health officers. DHS recommends that the County oppose this legislation because it would create confusion and disrupt existing disaster response plans at both the State and local level, and we concur. **Therefore, our Sacramento advocates will oppose AB 206.** Opposition is consistent with long-standing Board policy to oppose measures which dilute the powers and authority of local government and to support efforts to enhance preparedness of the public health system and Emergency Medical Service providers to respond to chemical, biological, and other forms of terrorism.

AB 206 is sponsored by the author and supported by the Health Officers Association of California. It is opposed by the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Child and Family Protection Association, and the City and County of San Francisco, in addition to CSAC and CHEAC. AB 206 is awaiting a hearing in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

### **Status of County Interest Legislation**

**County-supported SB 2 (Burton)** was placed on the Senate Appropriations Committee's suspense file on May 19, 2003 because of potential increased State costs. SB 2 would require employers to provide health care coverage, including prescription drugs, for eligible employees and dependents.

**County-sponsored SB 139 (Brulte)** passed the Senate Appropriations Committee on May 19, 2003, without requiring a hearing or vote because it contains no significant costs, and now proceeds to the Senate Floor. SB 139 makes clarifying changes to the "Safe Haven Law" and makes it easier for a parent to surrender a newborn in a safe environment.

**County-opposed SB 430 (Johnson)**, which requires three elections, two primary and one regular, in presidential election years, was placed on the Senate Appropriations Committee's suspense file on May 19, 2003.

**County-opposed SB 465 (Soto)**, which would allow for expansion of transit villages and weaken current redevelopment law that curbs abuse, was considered by the Senate Appropriations Committee on May 19, 2003, and placed on the Committee's suspense file because of the fiscal impact on the State general fund.

**County-opposed SB 629 (Soto)** which would extend the blood-borne infectious disease presumption to certain licensed health care professionals, was placed on the Senate Appropriations Committee's suspense file on May 19, 2003. The Department of Finance (DOF) registered opposition to the bill. It is expected that if SB 629 passes the Legislature, the Governor will veto the bill based upon DOF's opposition.

We will continue to keep you advised.

DEJ:GK  
MAL:JF:MS:ib

c:     Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors  
       County Counsel  
       Local 660  
       All Department Heads  
       Legislative Strategist  
       Coalition of County Unions  
       California Contract Cities Association  
       Independent Cities Association  
       League of California Cities  
       City Managers Associations